provided and the Discharger is required to monitor for these constituents to gather data for use in RPAs for future Order renewals and/or updates.

For Discharge Point 001, inconclusive results were reported for cyanide, acrolein, chlorobenzene, ethylbenzene, toluene, tributyltin, 1,1,1-trichloroethane, acrylonitrile, benzene, benzidine, carbon tetrachloride, chlordane, chlorodibromomethane, DDT, 3,3' dichlorobenzidine, 1,2 dichloroethane, dichlorobromomethane, dichloromethane, 1,3-dichloropropene, halomethanes, hexachlorobenzene, PAH, PCBs, TCDD, 1,1,2,2,-tetrachloroethane, tetrachloroethane, toxaphene, trichloroethylene, 1,2,3 trichloroethane and vinyl chloride. For benzidine, PCB and TCDD equivalents limits from the previous permit have been met with the existing treatment system and were applied in this Order, even though the results of the reasonable potential analysis were inconclusive. For each of the other constituents listed as inconclusive, less than 20% of the measurements included a detection, and for most, no detections were made. For the pollutants that have not been detected in the final effluent, the Discharger has made, and continues to make, an effort to achieve lower detection limits than are required in the 2015 Ocean Plan or 40 CFR 136. The permit includes a reopener to incorporate a new limit or performance goal based on an updated reasonable potential analysis. The MRP (Attachment E) of this Order also requires the Discharger to continue to monitor these constituents.

Bacteria were not found to have a reasonable potential to cause or exceed water quality criteria and no WQBELs for bacteria are proposed. Bacteria sampling is required at EFF-001A to demonstrate successful disinfection has resulted from secondary treatment. The 2015 Ocean Plan includes limits for bacteria in the public contact zones bounded by the shoreline and a distance of 1,000 feet. The State Water Resource Control Board Division of Drinking Water sets minimum protective bacteriological standards in the areas designated by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) for water-contact sport areas (REC-1) and shell-fish harvesting (SHELL), although these standards may not apply during a wet weather events. Compliance with bacteria criteria is demonstrated in this Order by receiving water monitoring between the outfall and the shoreline. The majority of measurements for fecal indicator bacteria, collected in the ocean near the Oxnard outfall between 2015 and 2017, were below the method detection limit (<2 MPN/100 mL). Indicator bacteria, including total and fecal coliforms, and enterococcus bacteria were not detected at the surface and or at depth further than 1000 feet from the zone of initial dilution. In all cases, indicator bacteria concentrations were below DDW/Basin Plan standards. Where bacteria standards have been routinely exceeded at the shore-line in this Region, this monitoring practice allows the development of a regulatory device such as the Santa Monica Bay Beaches Wet Weather Bacteria Total Maximum Daily Load Resolution No. 2006-005, which identified wet weather overland flow as the source of the bacteria, and successfully reduced beach bacteria through the control of storm water discharge.

5. **WQBEL Calculations**

From the Table 1 water quality objectives of the Ocean Plan, WQBELs are calculated according to the following equation for all pollutants, except for acute toxicity (if applicable) and radioactivity:

Ce=Co + Dm (Co-Cs)

Where

Ce = the effluent limitation (µg/L)

Co = the water quality objective to be met at the completion of initial dilution (µg/L)

Cs = background seawater concentration (µg/L) (see Table F-13 below)

Dm = minimum probable initial dilution expressed as parts seawater per part wastewater

Initial dilution is the process that results in the rapid and irreversible turbulent mixing of wastewater with ocean water around the point of discharge. For a submerged buoyant discharge, characteristic of most municipal and industrial wastes that are released from the submarine outfalls, the momentum of the discharge and its initial buoyancy act together to produce turbulent mixing. Initial dilution in this case is completed when the diluting wastewater ceases to rise in the water column and first begins to spread horizontally.

A 2017 dilution study confirmed the initial dilution factor (Dm) of 1:108 can apply. The value of Dm is described in detail in section I.B. of this Fact Sheet. Based on Table 3 of the 2015 Ocean Plan, Cs is equal to zero for all pollutants except the following:

Table F-12. Pollutants with Background Seawater Concentration

Constituent	Background Seawater Concentration (Cs)
Arsenic	3 µg/L
Copper	2 µg/L
Mercury	0.0005 µg/L
Silver	0.16 µg/L
Zinc	8 µg/L

Although a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to the exceedance of a water quality objective was not identified for chlorine residual or ammonia at Discharge Point 001, the calculations of the WQBELs are provided as an example.

Table F-13. Ocean Plan Water Quality Objectives (Co)

Constituents	6-Month Median	Daily Maximum	Instantaneous Maximum
Chlorine Residual	2 µg/L	8 µg/L	60 µg/L
Ammonia	0.60 mg/L	2.4 mg/L	6 mg/L

Using the equation, **Ce=Co + Dm (Co-Cs),** effluent limitations would be calculated as follows, before rounding to two significant digits, for discharge through Discharge Point 001, with a dilution ratio (Dm) of 1:108.

Chlorine Residual

Ce = 2 + 108 (2-0) = 218 µg/L (6 Month Median and Monthly Average)

Ce = 8 + 108 (8-0) = 872 µg/L (Daily Maximum)

Ce = 60 + 108 (60-0) = 6,540 µg/L (Instantaneous Maximum)

Chlorine residual shows no reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the Ocean Plan water quality objective of 2 µg/L. While wastewater disinfection with chlorine usually produces the chlorine residual and the byproducts of chlorination are highly toxic to aquatic life, the maximum monthly chlorine residual at EFF-001B was 0.08 mg/L and below the 2013 Performance Goal (PG) of 0.1 µg/L, so no limit was applied. Retention of the PG from the 2013 Order will ensure chlorine residual effluent concentration will remain lower than if the limit of 218 µg/L was imposed as an average monthly average. The final PG for chlorine residual is 0.1 µg/L.

Ammonia

Ce = 0.6 + 108(0.6-0) = 65 mg/L (6 Month Median and Monthly Average)

Ce = 2.4 + 108(2.4-0) = 262 mg/L mg/L (Daily Maximum)

Ce = 6 + 108(6-0) = 654 mg/L (Instantaneous Maximum)

Ammonia shows no reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the Ocean Plan water quality objective of 0.60 mg/L. ~~After dilution, t~~The maximum monthly effluent concentration for ammonia of ~~49.134.48~~ mg/L remains lower than the six-month median and monthly average limit based on the Ocean Plan of 65 mg/L. The ammonia limits calculated here are not incorporated into this Order. The Performance Goal (PG) was calculated to be ~~5143~~.8 mg/L using EFF-001B monitoring data collected between January 2016 and July 2018.~~.~~

Radioactivity:

The water quality objective for radioactivity in the 2015 California Ocean Plan states the value is not to exceed limits specified in Title 17, Division 1, Chapter 5, Subchapter 4, Group 3, Article 3, section 30253 of the California Code of Regulations and future changes to incorporate provisions of federal law as the changes take effect. This regulation does not establish a numerical effluent limit for radionuclides. During the preparation of R4-201~~3~~2-0094, Regional Water Board staff used Best Professional Judgment (BPJ) to establish radioactivity limits based on maximum effluent concentrations of 10.2 pCi/L for gross alpha and 50 for gross beta radioactivity. These limits are maintained because the existing limit of 50 pCi/L for gross beta was exceeded with a measure of 94 pCi/L. The Discharger conducted additional analysis of radium 226 and 228 as required by R4-2013-0094, and confirmed that no additional radionuclides were present at levels above the minimum detection levels. The Discharger determined that the exceedance of gross beta of 94, as a maximum monthly average in August 2014, could be attributed to discharge from a single industrial source, the Santa Clara Wastewater facility. While the industry no longer discharges to the collection system and compliance is expected, the limits are retained should the City wish to retain their discretion to accept new industries which treat radioactive oil field waste.

Based on the implementing procedures described above, effluent limitations were evaluated for Table 1 pollutants (excluding acute toxicity and radioactivity) from the 2015 Ocean Plan. No new limits have been incorporated into this Order. The proposed WQBELs in Table F-14 are all retained from the previous Order because there is insufficient evidence to determine there is no reasonable potential that the discharge will cause or contribute to the exceedance of some water quality objectives, and, in the case of radioactivity, because future sources could be permitted.

Table F-14. Proposed Water Quality Objectives (Ce)

Constituents	Units	Average Monthly	Instantaneous Maximum Daily[5]
Gross alpha	pCi/L		15
Gross beta	pCi/L		50
Combined radium 226-228	pCi/L		5
Tritium	pCi/L		20,000
Strontium 90	pCi/L		8

Constituents	Units	Average Monthly	Instantaneous Maximum Daily[5]
Uranium	pCi/L		20
Benzidine	µg/L	.0068	
PCB	µg/L	.0019	
TCDD	µg/L	.00000039	

6. **Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET).**

Whole effluent toxicity (WET) testing protects receiving waters from the aggregate toxic effect of a mixture of pollutants in the effluent or pollutants that are not typically monitored. An acute toxicity test is conducted over a short time period and measures mortality. A chronic toxicity test is conducted over a short or a longer period of time and may measure a sublethal endpoint such as reproduction or growth in addition to mortality. A constituent present at low concentrations may exhibit a chronic effect; however, a higher concentration of the same constituent may be required to produce an acute effect. Because of the nature of industrial discharges into the POTW sewershed, toxic constituents (or a mixture of constituents exhibiting toxic effects) may be present in the OWTP effluent.

A total of 108 chronic toxicity tests were conducted on OWTP final effluent between August 2013 and December 2017. None exceeded the 99 TUc maximum daily final effluent limitation for chronic toxicity. The discharge did not exhibit reasonable potential to exceed the water quality objectives for chronic toxicity at the discharge point based on 2015 Ocean Plan procedures for calculating reasonable potential.

The Ocean Plan addresses the application of chronic and acute toxicity requirements based on minimum probable dilutions (Dm) for ocean discharges. Following the 2015 Ocean Plan, dischargers are required to conduct chronic toxicity monitoring for ocean discharges with Dm factors ranging from 99 to 349 and Regional Water Boards may require acute toxicity monitoring in addition to chronic toxicity monitoring. Dischargers with Dm factors below 99 are required to conduct only chronic toxicity testing. The Dm for Discharge Point 001 is 108. The Dm is more than 99 for the outfall, even though the discharge does not exhibit reasonable potential to exceed the water quality objectives for chronic toxicity, the chronic toxicity final effluent limitation is maintained to ensure increases in brine concentration with process modification of the AWPF do not result in toxicity. No acute toxicity final effluent limitations have been assigned to the discharge since it is not required for this discharge point based on the requirements in the 2015 Ocean Plan and since the discharge did not exhibit reasonable potential to exceed the water quality objectives for acute toxicity.

The Ocean Plan establishes a daily maximum chronic toxicity objective of 1.0 TUc = 100/(No Observed Effect Concentration (NOEC)), using a 5-concentration hypothesis test, and a daily maximum acute toxicity objective of 0.3 TUa = 100/LC50, using a point estimate model. This Order/Permit includes final effluent limitations using the Test of Significant Toxicity (TST) hypothesis testing approach. This statistical approach is consistent with the Ocean Plan in that it provides maximum protection to the environment since it more reliably identifies acute and chronic toxicity than the current NOEC hypothesis-testing approach (See *2015 California Ocean Plan, section III.F and Appendix I*).

On July 07, 2014, the Chief Deputy of the Water Quality Division announced that the State Water Board would be releasing a revised version of the Chronic Toxicity Plan for

public comment within a few weeks. Regional Water Board staff awaits its release. Nevertheless, this Order/Permit contains a reopener to allow the Regional Water Board to modify the permit in the future, if necessary, to make it consistent with any new policy, plan, law, or regulation.

For this permit, chronic toxicity in the discharge is evaluated using a maximum daily effluent limitation that utilizes USEPA's 2010 TST hypothesis testing approach. The chronic toxicity effluent limitations are expressed as "Pass" for each maximum daily individual result.

In January 2010, USEPA published a guidance document titled EPA Regions 8, 9 and 10 Toxicity Training Tool, which among other things discusses permit limit expression for chronic toxicity. The document acknowledges that NPDES regulations at 40 CFR § 122.45(d) require that all permit limits be expressed, unless impracticable, as an Average Weekly Effluent Limitation (AWEL) and an Average Monthly Effluent Limitation (AMEL) for POTWs. Following section 5.2.3 of the Technical Support Document (TSD), the use of an AWEL is not appropriate for WET. In lieu of an AWEL for POTWs, USEPA recommends establishing a Maximum Daily Effluent Limitation (MDEL) for toxic pollutants and pollutants in water quality permitting, including WET. For an ocean discharge, this is appropriate because the 2015 Ocean Plan only requires a MDEL and does not include Average Monthly or Average Weekly Effluent Limitations for chronic toxicity (See 2015 California Ocean Plan, section II.D.7.).

The MDEL is the highest allowable value for the discharge measured during a calendar day or 24-hour period representing a calendar day. The AMEL is the highest allowable value for the average of daily discharges obtained over a calendar month. For WET, this is the average of individual WET test results for that calendar month. In June 2010, USEPA published another guidance document titled *National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Test of Significant Toxicity Implementation Document* (EPA 833-R-10-003, June 2010), in which they recommend the following: "Permitting authorities should consider adding the TST approach to their implementation procedures for analyzing valid WET data for their current NPDES WET Program." The TST approach is another statistical option for analyzing valid WET test data. Use of the TST approach does not result in any changes to EPA's WET test methods. Section 9.4.1.2 of USEPA's *Short-term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to West Coast Marine and Estuarine Organisms* (EPA/600/R-95/0136,1995), recognizes that, "the statistical methods recommended in this manual are not the only possible methods of statistical analysis." The TST approach can be applied to acute (survival) and chronic (sublethal) endpoints and is appropriate to use for both freshwater and marine EPA WET test methods.

The interpretation of the measurement result from USEPA's TST statistical approach (Pass/Fail) for effluent and receiving water samples is, by design, independent from the concentration-response patterns of the toxicity tests for samples when it is required. Therefore, when using the TST statistical approach, application of USEPA's 2000 guidance on effluent and receiving waters concentration-response patterns will not improve the appropriate interpretation of TST results as long as all Test Acceptability Criteria and other test review procedures – including those related to Quality Assurance for effluent and receiving water toxicity tests, reference toxicant tests, and control performance (mean, standard deviation, and coefficient of variation) – described by the WET test methods manual and TST guidance, are followed. The 2000 guidance may be used to identify reliable, anomalous, or inconclusive concentration-response patterns and associated statistical results to the extent that the guidance recommends review of test procedures and laboratory performance already recommended in the WET test methods

manual. The guidance does not apply to single concentration (IWC) and control statistical t-tests and does not apply to the statistical assumptions on which the TST is based. The Regional Water Board and USEPA will not consider a concentration-response pattern as a sufficient basis to determine that a TST t-test result for a toxicity test is anything other than valid, absent other evidence. In a toxicity laboratory, unexpected concentration-response patterns should not occur with any regular frequency and consistent reports of anomalous or inconclusive concentration-response patterns or test results that are not valid will require an investigation of laboratory practices.

Any Data Quality Objectives or Standard Operating Procedure used by the toxicity testing laboratory to identify and report valid, invalid, anomalous, or inconclusive effluent or receiving water toxicity test measurement results from the TST statistical approach, which include a consideration of concentration-response patterns and/or Percent Minimum Significant Differences (PMSD)s, must be submitted for review by the Regional Water Board, in consultation with USEPA and the State Water Board's Quality Assurance Officer and Environmental Laboratory Accreditations Program (40 CFR § 122.44(h)). The PMSD criteria only apply to compliance for NOEC and the sublethal endpoints of the NOEC, and therefore are not used to interpret TST results.

D. Final Effluent Limitation Considerations

1. Anti-Backsliding Requirements.

The final effluent limitations in this Order are at least as stringent as the effluent limitations in the previous Order, No. R4-2013-0094. Section 402(o)(2) of the CWA provides statutory exceptions to the general prohibition of backsliding contained in CWA section 402(o)(1).

The final effluent limitations for heptachlor epoxide for Discharge Point 001 were removed because new monitoring data indicated that the effluent did not have reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the applicable water quality objectives. The original limit had been applied in the absence of reliable effluent data because the analytical method detection level approximated the limit. The removal of the final effluent limitations for heptachlor epoxide will therefore not authorize a change in the mass emission rates or a relaxation in the treatment of the discharge and meets the backsliding exception under CWA section 303(d)(4)(B).

The dilution ratio for Discharge Point 001 increased from 1:98 to 1:108 based on the results of the 2017 dilution study, but no water quality based effluent limits were changed as a result, and technically based effluent limits do not vary with the dilution. However, the chronic toxicity final effluent limitations for Discharge Point 001 were revised based on a new dilution ratio. The resulting IWC for chronic toxicity decreased slightly from 1.02% effluent in the 2013 permit to 0.93% effluent (see section IV.C.6.) in this Order. The treatment process is maintained and all constituents are discharged at concentrations below Ocean Plan limits after dilution, so the change continues to be consistent with the Ocean Plan Water Quality Objectives and will not unreasonably affect present and anticipated beneficial uses of the Pacific Ocean in the vicinity of Ormond Beach. This is consistent with the antidegradation policy and therefore meets the backsliding exception under CWA section 402(o)(1)/303(d)(4).

The accompanying monitoring and reporting program requires continued data collection and if monitoring data show reasonable potential for a constituent to cause or contribute to an exceedance of water quality standards, the Order will be reopened to incorporate WQBELs. Such an approach ensures that the discharge will adequately protect water quality standards for designated beneficial uses and conform with antidegradation policies and antibacksliding provisions.

2. **Antidegradation Policies**

This Order includes both narrative and numeric final effluent limitations, receiving water limitations, performance goals, and mass emission benchmarks to maintain the chemical, physical, and biological characteristics, and to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water. These requirements ensure that all water quality objectives are being met outside the zone of initial dilution, thereby maintaining the beneficial uses. The Ocean Plan allows for minimal degradation within the zone of initial dilution as long as the water quality objectives are maintained just outside the zone of initial dilution. The minimal degradation permitted by the Ocean Plan is consistent with the antidegradation policy because it maintains maximum benefit to the people of the State, it will not unreasonably affect the present and anticipated beneficial uses, and it will not result in water quality less than that prescribed in the policies.

The final effluent limitations from the previous order have been retained in this Order/Permit, except for heptachlor epoxide. Under CWA sections 402(o)(1)/303(d)(4)(B) for waters in attainment, removal of the final effluent limitations for heptachlor epoxide for the Discharge Point 001 is consistent with the antidegradation provisions of 40 CFR part 131.12 and State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16 because the constituent has no reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of a water quality objective and so the discharge at this outfall will not degrade existing high-quality water.

The mass-based final effluent limitations continue to be based on the design flow rate of 31.7 MGD.

3. **Stringency of Requirements for Individual Pollutants**

This Order contains both technology-based and water quality-based effluent limitations for individual pollutants. The technology-based effluent limitations consist of restrictions on $BOD_5 20^0C$, TSS, turbidity, oil and grease and pH. This Order's technology-based pollutant restrictions implement the minimum, applicable federal technology-based requirements.

Water quality-based effluent limitations have been scientifically derived to implement water quality objectives that protect beneficial uses. Both the beneficial uses and the water quality objectives have been approved pursuant to federal law and the applicable federal water quality standards. The scientific procedures for calculating the individual water quality-based effluent limitations are based on the Ocean Plan, which was approved by the USEPA on February 14, 2006 and has since been further amended. Most beneficial uses and water quality objectives contained in the Basin Plan were approved under state law and submitted to and approved by the USEPA prior to May 30, 2000. Any water quality objectives and beneficial uses submitted to USEPA prior to May 30, 2000, but not approved by USEPA before that date, are nonetheless "applicable water quality standards for purposes of the CWA" pursuant to 40 CFR section 131.21(c)(1). The remaining water quality objectives and beneficial uses implemented by this Order were approved by USEPA and are applicable water quality standards pursuant to section 131.21(c)(2). Collectively, this Order's restrictions on individual pollutants are no more stringent than required to implement the requirements of the CWA.

Table F-15. Summary of Final Effluent Limitations for Discharge Point 001

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations[10]				Performance Goals[11]	Basis
		Average Monthly[12]	Average Weekly[13]	Maximum Daily[14]	Instantaneous Maximum[15]		
$BOD_5 20^0C$[16]	mg/L	30	45	--	--	--	Secondary Treatment
	lbs/day[17]	7,960	11,900	--	--	--	
	% removal	85	--	--	--	--	
TSS	mg/L	30	45	--	--	--	Secondary Treatment/ Ocean Plan
	lbs/day[17]	7,960	11,900	--	--	--	
	% removal	85	--	--	--	--	
pH	pH unit	6.0(instantaneous minimum)-9.0(instantaneous maximum)					Secondary Treatment/ Ocean Plan
Oil and Grease	mg/L	25	40		75	--	Secondary Treatment/ Ocean Plan
	lbs/day[17]	6,630	10,600		19,900	--	
Settleable Solids	ml/L	1.0	1.5		3.0		Secondary Treatment/ Ocean Plan
Turbidity	NTU	75	100		225		Secondary Treatment/ Ocean Plan
Temperature	°F				100		Thermal Plan

[10] The minimum dilution ratio used to calculate effluent limitations for nonconventional and toxic pollutants for Discharge Point 001 is 1: 108 for all (i.e., 108 parts sea water to one-part effluent)

[11] The performance goals are based upon the actual performance data of the Oxnard Wastewater Treatment Plant and are specified only as an indication of the treatment efficiency of the plant. They are not considered effluent limitations or standards for the treatment plant. The Discharger shall make best efforts to maintain, if not improve, the effluent quality at the level of these performance goals. The Executive Officer of the Regional Water Board may modify any of the performance goals if the Discharger requests and has demonstrated that the change is warranted. See Procedures for the determination of performance goals at section V. of Fact Sheet.

[12] Average monthly effluent limitations for benzidine, PCBs, and TCDD equivalents at Discharge Point 001 are based on the 6-month median water quality objectives in the 2015 Ocean Plan.

[13] For intermittent discharges, the daily value used to calculate the average monthly values shall be considered to equal zero for days on which no discharge occurred.

[14] The maximum daily, average weekly and average monthly effluent limitations shall apply to flow weighted 24-hour composite samples. They may apply to grab samples if the collection of composite samples for those constituents is not appropriate because of the instability of the constituents.

[15] The instantaneous maximum effluent limitations shall apply to grab samples.

[16] Average Weekly and Monthly values may be calculated from daily measurements. Compliance with BOD and TSS, and BOD and TSS % removal at EFF-001A.

[17] The mass emission rates are based on the existing plant design flow rate of 31.7 MGD plus the brine waste, and are calculated as follows: Flow (MGD) x Concentration (mg/L) x 8.34 (conversion factor) = lbs/day.

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations[10]				Perform-ance Goals[11]	Basis
		Average Monthly [12]	Average Weekly[13]	Maximum Daily[14]	Instan-taneous Maximum [15]		
Arsenic	µg/L	--	--	--	--	2[18]	No RP
Cadmium	µg/L	--	--	--	--	1[19]	No RP
Chromium (VI)[20]	µg/L	--	--	--	--	8	No RP
Copper	µg/L	--	--	--	--	30	No RP
Lead	µg/L	--	--	--	--	23	No RP
Mercury	µg/L	--	--	--	--	0.3	No RP
Nickel	µg/L	--	--	--	--	8	No RP
Silver	µg/L	--	--	--	--	2.5	No RP
Selenium	µg/L	--	--	--	--	6.4	No RP
Zinc	µg/L	--	--	--	--	35	No RP
Cyanide	µg/L	--	--	--	--	25	No RP
Chlorine Residual	µg/L	--	--	--	--	0.13	No RP
Ammonia as N	mg/L	--	--	--	--	5143.8	No RP
Phenolic compounds non-chlorinated	µg/L	--	--	--	--	5	No RP
Phenolic compoundschlorinated	µg/L	--	--	--	--	0.42	No RP
Endosulfan	µg/L	--	--	--	--	0.05	No RP
HCH	µg/L	--	--	--	--	0.1	No RP
Endrin	µg/L	--	--	--	--	0.05	No RP
Chronic toxicity (TST)[21]	Pass or Fail	--	--	Pass	--	--	Ocean Plan

[18] The existing performance goal is carried forward based on best professional judgement because new information would otherwise call for a relaxation of the PG.

[19] When conclusive but nonparametric finding of no reasonable potential is found, best professional judgement is used to retain existing PG.

[20] See Attachment A for definitions of terms.

[21] The Chronic Toxicity final effluent limitation is protective of both the numeric acute and chronic toxicity 2015 Ocean Plan water quality objectives. The final effluent limitation will be implemented using *Short-term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to West Coast Marine and Estuarine Organisms* (EPA/600/R-95/136, 1995), current USEPA guidance in the *National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Test of Significant Toxicity Implementation Document* (EPA 833-R-10-003, June 2010) (http://water.epa.gov/polwaste/npdes/basics/upload/wet_final_tst_implementation2010.pdf) and *EPA Regions 8, 9, and 10, Toxicity Training Tool (January 2010)*. The Maximum Daily Effluent Limitation (MDEL) shall be reported as "Pass" or "Fail." (Also % Effect (percent effect) shall be reported.) See the MRP

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations[10]				Perform-ance Goals[11]	Basis
		Average Monthly [12]	Average Weekly[13]	Maximum Daily[14]	Instan-taneous Maximum [15]		
Radioactivity[22]							
Gross alpha	pCi/L	--	--	--	15	--	No RP, BPJ
Gross beta	pCi/L	--	--	--	50	--	No RP, BPJ
Combined Radium226 and 228	pCi/L	--	--	--	5	--	No RP, BPJ
Tritium	pCi/L	--	--	--	20,000	--	No RP, BPJ
Strontium 90	pCi/L	--	--	--	8	--	No RP, BPJ
Uranium	pCi/L	--	--	--	20	--	No RP, BPJ
Human Health Toxicants – Non-Carcinogens							
Acrolein	µg/L	--	--	--	--	10	No RP
Antimony	µg/L	--	--	--	--	2.5	No RP
Bis (2-chloro ethoxy) methane	µg/L	--	--	--	--	25	No RP
Bis (2-chloro-isopropyl) ether	µg/L	--	--	--	--	10	No RP
Chloro-benzene	µg/L	--	--	--	--	2.5	No RP
Chromium III	µg/L					8	No RP
Di-n-butyl-phthalate	µg/L	--	--	--	--	0.33	No RP
Dichloro-benzenes	µg/L	--	--	--	--	2.5	No RP
Diethyl phthalate	µg/L	--	--	--	--	0.25	No RP
Dimethyl phthalate	µg/L	--	--	--	--	10	No RP
2-Methyl-4,6-dinitrophenol	µg/L	--	--	--	--	25	No RP
2,4-Dinitrophenol	µg/L	--	--	--	--	25	No RP
Ethyl benzene	µg/L	--	--	--	--	2.5	No RP
Fluoranthene	µg/L	--	--	--	--	0.25	No RP
Hexachloro-cyclopenta-dine	µg/L	--	--	--	--	25	No RP
Nitro-benzene	µg/L	--	--	--	--	5	No RP
Thallium	µg/L	--	--	--	--	5	No RP

[22] Radioactivity: As noted in the 2015 California Ocean Plan: Not to exceed limits specified in Title 17, division 1, chapter 5, subchapter 4, group 3, article 3, section 30253 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR). Reference to section 30253 is prospective, including future changes to any incorporated provisions of federal law, as the changes take effect.

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations[10]				Perform-ance Goals[11]	Basis
		Average Monthly [12]	Average Weekly[13]	Maximum Daily[14]	Instan-taneous Maximum [15]		
Toluene	µg/L	--	--	--	--	0.6	No RP
Tributyltin	µg/L	--	--	--	--	0.0263	No RP
1,1,1-Trichloro-ethane	µg/L	--	--	--	--	2.5	No RP
Human Health Toxicants – Carcinogens							
Acrylonitrile	µg/L	--	--	--	--	10	No RP
Aldrin	µg/L	--	--	--	--	0.025	No RP
Benzene	µg/L	--	--	--	--	2.5	No RP
Benzidine	µg/L	0.0068	--	--	--	--	Inconclusive RP, Existing Limit
	lbs/day[17]	0.0018	--	--	--		
Beryllium	µg/L	--	--	--	--	2.5	No RP
Bis (2-chloroethyl) ether	µg/L	--	--	--	--	5	No RP
Bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate	µg/L	--	--	--	--	15	No RP
Carbon tetrachloride	µg/L	--	--	--	--	2.5	No RP
Chlordane	µg/L		--	--	--	0.5	No RP
Chloro-dibromo-methane	µg/L	--	--	--	--	1.3	No RP
Chloroform	µg/L	--	--	--	--	1.2	No RP
DDT[20]	µg/L	--	--	--	--	0.25	No RP
1,4-Dichloro-benzene	µg/L	--	--	--	--	3	No RP
3,3'dichloro-benzidine	µg/L		--	--	--	25	No RP
1,2-Dichloro-ethane	µg/L	--	--	--	--	2.5	No RP
1,1-Dichloro-ethylene	µg/L	--	--	--	--	2.5	No RP
Bromodi-chloro-ethane	µg/L	--	--	--	--	2.5	No RP
Dichloro-methane	µg/L	--	--	--	--	2.5	No RP
1,3-Dichloro-propene	µg/L	--	--	--	--	2.5	No RP
Dieldrin	µg/L	--	--	--	--	0.05	No RP
2,4-Dinitrotoluene	µg/L	--	--	--	--	25	No RP

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations[10]				Perform-ance Goals[11]	Basis
		Average Monthly[12]	Average Weekly[13]	Maximum Daily[14]	Instan-taneous Maximum[15]		
1,2-Dipheny-lhydrazine	µg/L	--	--	--	--	5	No RP
Halo-methanes[20]	µg/L	--	--	--	--	4.4	No RP
Heptachlor	µg/L	--	--	--	--	0.05	No RP
Heptachlor epoxide	µg/L	--	--	--	--	0.05[23]	No RP
Hexachloro-benzene	µg/L	--	--	--	--	5	No RP
Hexachloro-butadiene	µg/L	--	--	--	--	5	No RP
Hexachloro-ethane	µg/L	--	--	--	--	5	No RP
Isophorone	µg/L	--	--	--	--	5	No RP
N-Nitrosodi-methylamine	µg/L	--	--	--	--	25	No RP
N-Nitrosodi-N-propylamine	µg/L	--	--	--	--	25	No RP
N-Nitrosodi-phenylamine	µg/L	--	--	--	--	5	No RP
PAHs[20]	µg/L	--	--	--	--	0.097	No RP
PCBs[20]	µg/L	0.0019	--	--	--	--	Inconclusive RP, Existing Limit
	lbs/day[17]	0.0005	--	--	--	--	
TCDD equivalents[20]	pg/L ug/L	0.00000039	--	--	--		Inconclusive RP, Existing Limit
	lbs/day[17]	0.0000001					
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloro-ethane	µg/L	--	--	--	--	2.5	No RP
Tetrachloro-ethylene	µg/L	--	--	--	--	2.5	No RP
Toxaphene	µg/L	--	--	--	--	2.5	No RP
Trichloro-ethylene	µg/L	--	--	--	--	2.5	No RP
1,1,2-Tri-chloro-ethane	µg/L	--	--	--	--	2.5	No RP
2,4,6-Tri-chloro-phenol	µg/L	--	--	--	--	0.74	No RP
Vinyl chloride	µg/L	--	--	--	--	2.5	No RP

[23] A non paramateric RPA analysis concluded there was no need to maintain the limit in R4-2013-0094, as no detections were found. A value five times the minimum level in the 2015 Ocean Plan is used as the PG.

E. Interim Effluent Limitations – Not Applicable

F. Land Discharge Specifications – Not Applicable

G. Recycling Specifications – Not Applicable

V. PERFORMANCE GOALS

Section III.F.1, of the 2015 Ocean Plan allows the Regional Water Board to establish more restrictive water quality objectives and effluent limitations than those set forth in the 2015 Ocean Plan as necessary for the protection of the beneficial uses of ocean waters.

Pursuant to this provision and to implement the recommendation of the Water Quality Advisory Task Force (*Working Together for an Affordable Clean Water Environment, A final report presented to the California Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region by Water Quality Advisory Task Force,* September 30, 1993) that was adopted by the Regional Water Board on November 1, 1993, performance goals that are more stringent than those based on Ocean Plan objectives are prescribed in this Order. This approach is consistent with the antidegradation policy in that it requires the Discharger to maintain its treatment level and effluent quality, recognizing normal variations in treatment efficiency and sampling and analytical techniques. However, this approach does not address substantial changes in treatment plant operations that could significantly affect the quality of the treated effluent.

While performance goals were previously placed in many POTW permits in the Region, they have been discontinued for inland surface water discharges. For inland surface waters, the California Toxics Rule (40 CFR § 131.38) has resulted in effluent limitations as stringent as many performance goals. However, the Ocean Plan allows for significant dilution, and the continued use of performance goals serves to maintain existing treatment levels and effluent quality and supports State and federal antidegradation policies.

The performance goals are based upon the actual performance of the OWTP and are specified only as an indication of the treatment efficiency of the Facility. Performance goals are intended to minimize pollutant loading (primarily for toxics), while maintaining the incentive for future voluntary improvement of water quality whenever feasible, without the imposition of more stringent limits based on improved performance. They are not considered enforceable limitations or standards for the regulation of the discharge from the treatment facility. The Executive Officer may modify any of the performance goals if the Discharger requests and has demonstrated that the change is warranted.

A. Procedures for the Determination of Performance Goals

For constituents that have been routinely detected in the effluent (at least 20 percent detectable data), performance goals are based on the one-sided, upper 95 percent confidence bound for the 95th percentile of the effluent performance data (UCB95/95) from August 2013 through December 2017 using the RPA protocol contained in the 2015 Ocean Plan. Effluent data are assumed log normally distributed. Performance goals are calculated according to the equation PG = Co + Dm (Co-Cs) and setting Co = UCB95/95. The calculation of the performance goal for ammonia used the upper 99th percent confidence bound to optimize recycled water production.

1. If the maximum detected effluent concentration (MEC) is greater than the calculated performance goal, then the calculated performance goal is used as the performance goal;
2. If the maximum detected effluent concentration is less than the calculated performance goal, then the MEC is used as the performance goal, or;
3. If the performance goal determined in part 1 or 2 is greater than the WQO in the 2015 Ocean Plan after considering dilution, then the WQO is used as the performance goal.

For example, a performance goal for arsenic at Discharge Point 001 is calculated as follows:

Arsenic

Co = UCB95/95 = 2.9835; Dm = 108; Cs = 3

C_{PG} = Performance Goal = 2.9835 + 108(2.9835-3) = 1.2015 µg/L

The existing PG in R4-2013-0094 is 2 µg/L and given that the overall system process will change to expand recycled water production, resulting in comingled discharges of concentrated brine, the existing PG is maintained where the data would otherwise lead to a reduction of the Performance Goal. The final arsenic PG is 2 µg/L.

In some cases where monitoring data might otherwise trigger a much higher Performance Goal (PG), the existing PG is maintained to continue or improve current performance. Another example is hexavalent chromium, where the new Maximum Effluent Concentration (MEC) remains below the existing performance goal and insufficient data is present to develop a PG more refined than a high value of 25 µg/L, calculated from a multiple of the minimum level. The existing PG of 8 µg/L is maintained. In addition, the existing PG for trivalent chromium is also carried forward at 8 µg/L. Another example is mercury, where a higher performance goal was considered because the MEC of 0.38 µg/L exceeded the existing PG of 0.3, but the calculated higher PG of 2.5 µg/L was judged too large an increase in concentration to be allowed without triggering additional investigation into the source of the mercury given the 2014-2016 303(d) listing for historic mercury in the adjacent Santa Monica Bay.

For constituents where monitoring data have consistently shown nondetectable levels (less than 20 percent detectable data), the existing performance goals are maintained or set at 5 times the minimum level (ML) given in the 2015 Ocean Plan. If the maximum detected effluent concentration is less than the calculated value based on ML, then the MEC is used as the performance goal. In some cases where monitoring data might otherwise trigger a much higher Performance Goal (PG), the existing PG is maintained to continue or improve current performance. Examples are Di-n-Butyl Phthalate, Diethyl phthalate, Fluoranthene, Toluene, Tributyltin, and Chlorodibromomethane.

For nickel, where the MEC is below the performance goal of 8, the improved performance means the PG would go down. The existing value is maintained as the brine concentration change could result in increased levels, but still result in additional recycled water production and protection of marine aquatic life. Similarly, falling effluent concentrations for residual chlorine would otherwise result in a reduced PG, but the use of chlorine for disinfection during multiple treatment steps to optimize the production of recycled water increases the need for flexibility in performance. The existing residual chlorine value is used.

For lead, the existing PG of 23 µg/l is maintained and is above the detection of 19 µg/L. Detections of 5.7, 11.8 and 13.9 µg/L demonstrate that the metal is present in the effluent with some consistency. The data would result in a very small calculated performance goal of 2.5 µg/L, which could not be attained, but would lead to additional study about the source of the metal. In this case, existing lead concentration is known to be sourced by the collection

system's historic piping, which is being replaced with construction upgrades. Maintaining the performance goal will ensure this activity continues and protects against the introduction of new sources of lead.

The limit for heptachlor epoxide is no longer needed because monitoring data is present and no reasonable potential is present. The PG would be higher than the existing limit of 0.002 µg/L, so a PG of 0.05 but is applied here because there is no need to maintain continued performance at the lower level in the absence of reasonable potential to cause or contribute to the exceedance of a water quality objective.

Performance goals for Discharge Point 001 are prescribed in this Order. The listed performance goals are not enforceable effluent limitations or standards. The Discharger shall maintain, if not improve, its treatment efficiency. Any two exceedances of the performance goals shall trigger an investigation into the cause of the exceedance. If the exceedance persists in three successive monitoring periods, the Discharger shall submit a written report to the Regional Water Board on the nature of the exceedance, the results of the investigation as to the cause of the exceedance, and the corrective actions taken or proposed corrective measures with timetable for implementation, if necessary.

VI. RATIONALE FOR RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS.

A. Surface Water

The Basin Plan and the Ocean Plan contain numeric and narrative water quality objectives applicable to all surface waters within the Los Angeles Region. Water quality objectives include an objective to maintain the high-quality waters pursuant to federal regulations (40 CFR 131.12) and State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16. Receiving water limitations in the tentative Order are included to ensure protection of beneficial uses of the receiving water.

B. Groundwater – Not Applicable.

VII. RATIONALE FOR PROVISIONS.

A. Standard Provisions

Standard Provisions, which apply to all NPDES permits in accordance with 40 CFR section 122.41, and additional conditions applicable to specified categories of permits in accordance with 40 CFR section 122.42, are provided in Attachment D to the Order.

Sections 122.41(a)(1) and (b) through (n) of 40 CFR establish conditions that apply to all State-issued NPDES permits. These conditions must be incorporated into the permits either expressly or by reference. If incorporated by reference, a specific citation to the regulations must be included in the Order. Section 123.25(a)(12) allows the state to omit or modify conditions to impose more stringent requirements. In accordance with 40 CFR section 123.25, this Order omits federal conditions that address enforcement authority specified in 40 CFR sections 122.41(j)(5) and (k)(2) because the enforcement authority under the CWC is more stringent. In lieu of these conditions, this Order incorporates by reference CWC section 13387(e).

B. Special Provisions

1. Reopener Provisions

These provisions are based on 40 CFR § 123.25. The Regional Water Board may reopen the Order to modify conditions and requirements. Causes for modifications can include, but are not limited to, the promulgation of new regulations, modification in

biosolids use or disposal practices, or adoption of new regulations by the State Water Board or Regional Water Board, including revisions to the Ocean Plan and Basin Plan.

2. **Special Studies and Additional Monitoring Requirements**

   a. **Antidegradation Analysis and Engineering Report for Proposed Plant Expansion:** This provision is based on the State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16, which requires the Regional Water Board in regulating the discharge of waste to maintain high quality waters of the state. The Discharger must demonstrate that it has implemented adequate controls (e.g., adequate treatment capacity) to ensure that high quality waters will be maintained. This provision requires the Discharger to clarify that it has increased plant capacity through the addition of new treatment system(s) to obtain alternative effluent limitations for the discharge from the treatment system(s). This provision requires the Discharger to report specific time schedules for the plant's projects. This provision requires the Discharger to submit a report to the Regional Water Board for approval.

   b. **Operations Plan for Proposed Expansion**. This provision is based on section 13385(j)(1)(D) of the CWC and allows a time period not to exceed 90 days in which the Discharger may adjust and test the treatment system(s). This provision requires the Discharger to submit an Operations Plan describing the actions the Discharger will take during the period of adjusting and testing to prevent violations.

   c. **Treatment Plant Capacity.** The treatment plant capacity study required by this Order shall serve as an indicator for the Regional Water Board regarding the Facility's increasing hydraulic capacity and growth in the service area.

   d. **Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE) Requirements.** If the discharge consistently exceeds an effluent limitation for toxicity as specified in this Order, the Discharger shall conduct a TRE as detailed in section V of the MRP (Attachment E). The TRE will help the Discharger identify the possible source(s) of toxicity. The Discharger shall take all reasonable steps to reduce toxicity to the required level.

3. **Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention**

   a. **Spill Clean-Up Contingency Plan (SCCP)**: Since spills or overflows are a common event at the POTW, this Order requires the Discharger to review and update, if necessary, its SCCP after each incident. The Discharger shall ensure that the up-to-date SCCP is readily available to the sewage system personnel at all times and that the sewage personnel are familiar with it.

   b. **Pollutant Minimization Program (PMP):** This provision is based on the requirements of section III.C.9 of the Ocean Plan.

4. **Construction, Operation, and Maintenance Specifications**

   This provision is based on the requirements of 40 CFR §122.41(e) and the previous Order.

5. **Special Provisions for Publicly-Owned Treatment Works (POTWs)**

   a. **Sludge (Biosolids) Requirements**. To implement CWA section 405(d), on February 19, 1993, USEPA promulgated 40 CFR § 503 to regulate the use and disposal of municipal sewage sludge. This regulation was amended on September 3, 1999. The regulation requires that producers of sewage sludge meet certain reporting, handling, and disposal requirements. It is the responsibility of the Discharger to comply with said regulations that are enforceable by USEPA, because California has not been delegated the authority to implement this program.

b. **Pretreatment Program Requirements**. This permit contains pretreatment requirements consistent with applicable effluent limitations, national standards of performance, and toxic and performance effluent standards established pursuant to sections 208(b), 301, 302, 303(d), 304, 306, 307, 403, 404, 405, and 501 of the CWA, and amendments thereto. This permit contains requirements for the implementation of an effective pretreatment program pursuant to section 307 of the CWA; 40 CFR § 35 and 403; and/or section 2233, Title 23, California Code of Regulations.

c. **Spill Reporting Requirements for POTWs**. This Order established a reporting protocol for how different types of spills, overflows, and bypasses of raw or partially treated sewage from the POTW shall be reported to regulatory agencies.

d. **Collection System**. The State Water Board issued General Waste Discharge Requirements for Sanitary Sewer Systems, Water Quality Order 2006-0003-DWQ (General Order) on May 2, 2006. The State Water Board amended the Monitoring and Reporting Program for the General Order through Order WQ 2013-0058-EXEC on August 6, 2013. The General Order requires public agencies that own or operate sanitary sewer systems with sewer lines one mile of pipe or greater to enroll for coverage and comply with the General Order. The General Order requires agencies to develop sanitary sewer management plans and report all sanitary sewer overflows, among other requirements and prohibitions

6. **Compliance Schedules – Not applicable**

VIII. RATIONALE FOR MONITORING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

Section 308(a) of the federal Clean Water Act and sections 122.41(h), (j)-(l), 122.44(i), and 122.48 of Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (40 CFR) require that all NPDES permits specify monitoring and reporting requirements. CWC sections 13267 and 13383 also authorize the Regional Water Board to establish monitoring, inspection, entry, reporting, and recordkeeping requirements. The MRP establishes monitoring, reporting, and recordkeeping requirements that implement federal and state requirements. The following provides the rationale for the monitoring and reporting requirements in the MRP for this facility.

A. Influent Monitoring

Influent monitoring is required to determine compliance with NPDES permit conditions, assess treatment plant performance,and assess effectiveness of the Pretreatment Program. Influent monitoring in this Order follows the influent monitoring requirements in the previous Order.

B. Effluent Monitoring

The Discharger is required to conduct monitoring of the permitted discharges in order to evaluate compliance with permit limitations and conditions. Monitoring requirements are specified in the MRP (Attachment E). This Order requires compliance with the MRP, and is based on 40 CFR § 122.48, 122.44(i), 122.41(j), 122.62, 122.63, and 124.5. The MRP is a standard requirement in NPDES permits (including this Order) issued by the Regional Water Board. In addition to containing definition of terms, it specifies general sampling/analytical protocols and the requirements of reporting spills, violation, and routine monitoring data in accordance with NPDES regulations, the CWC, and Regional Water Board policies. The MRP also contains sampling program specific for the Discharger's wastewater treatment plant. It defines the sampling stations and frequency, pollutants to be monitored, and additional reporting requirements. Pollutants to be monitored include all pollutants for which effluent limitations are specified.

Monitoring for those pollutants expected to be present in the discharge from the facility, will be required as shown on the proposed MRP (Attachment E) and as required in the Ocean Plan.

Monitoring frequency for the constituents is based on historic monitoring frequency, Best Professional Judgment, and the following criteria:

Criterion 1: Monitoring frequency will be monthly for those pollutants with reasonable potential to exceed water quality objectives (monitoring has shown an exceedance of the objectives) or where Best Professional Judgement indicates additional monitoring is necessary due to existing or anticipated changes in the treatment process or environment;

Criterion 2: Monitoring frequency will be quarterly for those pollutants in which some or all of the historic effluent monitoring data detected the pollutants, but without reasonable potential to exceed water quality objectives; and

Criterion 3: Monitoring frequency will be semiannually for those pollutants in which all of the historic effluent monitoring data have had non-detected concentrations of the pollutants and without current reasonable potential to exceed water quality objectives.

Table F-16. Effluent Monitoring Frequency Comparison

Parameter	Monitoring Frequency (2013 Permit)	Monitoring Frequency (2018 Permit)
Flow	Continuous	Continuous
$BOD_5 20^oC$	daily	weekly
Total Suspended Solids	daily	weekly
pH	daily	weekly
Oil and Grease	daily	weekly
Temperature	weekly	weekly
Settleable Solids	daily	weekly
Turbidity	continuous	continuous
Nitrate Nitrogen	monthly	monthly
Nitrite Nitrogen	monthly	monthly
Organic Nitrogen	monthly	monthly
Total coliform	daily	daily
Fecal Coliform	5 times/month	5 times/month
Enterococcus	5 times/month	5 times/month
Arsenic	semiannually	semiannually
Cadmium	semiannually	semiannually
Chromium VI	semiannually	semiannually
Copper	semiannually	semiannually
Lead	semiannually	semiannually
Mercury	semiannually	semiannually
Nickel	semiannually	semiannually
Selenium	semiannually	semiannually
Silver	semiannually	semiannually

Parameter	Monitoring Frequency (2013 Permit)	Monitoring Frequency (2018 Permit)
Zinc	semiannually	semiannually
Cyanide	semiannually	semiannually
Total Residual Chlorine	continuous	continuous
Ammonia Nitrogen	monthly	monthly
Toxicity, Chronic	monthly	monthly
Phenolic Compounds (non-chlorinated)	semiannually	semiannually
Phenolic Compounds (chlorinated)	semiannually	semiannually
Endosulfan	semiannually	semiannually
Endrin	semiannually	semiannually
HCH	semiannually	semiannually
Radioactivity (including gross alpha, gross beta, combined radium-226 & radium-228, tritium, strontium-90 and uranium)	semiannually	semiannually
Acrolein	semiannually	semiannually
Antimony	semiannually	semiannually
Bis(2-chloroethoxy) methane	semiannually	semiannually
Bis(2-chloroisopropyl) ether	semiannually	semiannually
Chlorobenzene	semiannually	semiannually
Chromium (III)	semiannually	semiannually
Di-n-butyl-phthalate	semiannually	semiannually
Dichlorobenzenes	semiannually	semiannually
Diethyl phthalate	semiannually	semiannually
Dimethyl phthalate	semiannually	semiannually
4,6-dinitro-2-methylphenol	semiannually	semiannually
2,4-Dinitrophenol	semiannually	semiannually
Ethylbenzene	semiannually	semiannually
Fluoranthene	semiannually	semiannually
Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	semiannually	semiannually
Nitrobenzene	semiannually	semiannually
Thallium	semiannually	semiannually
Toluene	semiannually	semiannually
Tributyltin	semiannually	semiannually
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	semiannually	semiannually
Acrylonitrile	semiannually	semiannually
Aldrin	semiannually	semiannually
Benzene	semiannually	semiannually
Benzidine	quarterly	quarterly

Parameter	Monitoring Frequency (2013 Permit)	Monitoring Frequency (2018 Permit)
Beryllium	semiannually	semiannually
Bis(2-chloroethyl) ether	semiannually	semiannually
Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate	semiannually	semiannually
Carbon tetrachloride	semiannually	semiannually
Chlordane	semiannually	semiannually
Chlorodibromomethane	semiannually	semiannually
Chloroform	semiannually	semiannually
DDT	semiannually	semiannually
1,4-dichlorobenzene	semiannually	semiannually
3,3'-dichlorobenzidine	semiannually	semiannually
1,2-Dichloroethane	semiannually	semiannually
1,1-Dichloroethylene	semiannually	semiannually
Dichlorobromomethane	semiannually	semiannually
Dichloromethane	semiannually	semiannually
1,3-Dichloropropene	semiannually	semiannually
Dieldrin	semiannually	semiannually
2,4-dinitrotoluene	semiannually	semiannually
1,2-diphenylhydrazine	semiannually	semiannually
Halomethanes	semiannually	semiannually
Heptachlor	semiannually	semiannually
Heptachlor epoxide	quarterly	semiannually
Hexachlorobenzene	semiannually	semiannually
Hexachlorobutadiene	semiannually	semiannually
Hexachloroethane	semiannually	semiannually
Isophorone	semiannually	semiannually
N-Nitrosodimethylamine	semiannually	semiannually
N-Nitrosodi-N-propylamine	semiannually	semiannually
N-Nitrosodiphenylamine	semiannually	semiannually
PAHs	semiannually	semiannually
PCBs as Aroclors	quarterly	quarterly
PCBs as Congeners	semiannually	semiannually
TCDD Equivalents	quarterly	quarterly
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	semiannually	semiannually
Tetrachloroethylene	semiannually	semiannually
Toxaphene	semiannually	semiannually
Trichloroethylene	semiannually	semiannually
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	semiannually	semiannually
2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	semiannually	semiannually

Parameter	Monitoring Frequency (2013 Permit)	Monitoring Frequency (2018 Permit)
Vinyl chloride	semiannually	semiannually
Methyl-tert-butyl-ether	semiannually	semiannually
Remaining pollutants in Table B of the 2009 Ocean Plan	semiannually	semiannually

C. Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Requirements

The rationale for WET has been discussed extensively in section IV.C.6. of this Fact Sheet.

D. Receiving Water Monitoring.

1. Surface Water and Benthic Monitoring

Receiving water, benthic infauna, and sediment chemistry monitoring is required to determine compliance with receiving water limitations,to characterize the water quality of the receiving water, and ensure beneficial uses are protected. Requirements are based on the Ocean Plan and the Basin Plan. The conceptual framework for the receiving water program has three components that comprise a range of spatial and temporal scales: (a) core monitoring; (b) regional monitoring; and (c) special studies. Additional information can be found in this attachment at II.F and the monitoring and reporting program in Attachment E.

2. Groundwater – Not Applicable

E. Other Monitoring Requirements

1. Outfall Inspection

This survey investigates the condition of the outfall structures to determine if the structures are in serviceable condition to ensure their continued safe operation. The data collected will be used for a periodic assessment of the integrity of the outfall pipes and ballasting system.

2. Biosolids/Sludge Monitoring

Attachment H establishes monitoring and reporting requirements for the storage, handling and disposal practices of biosolids/sludge generated from the operation of this POTW.

3. Discharge Monitoring Report-Quality Assurance (DMR-QA) Study Program

Under the authority of section 308 of the CWA (33 U.S.C. § 1318), USEPA requires major and selected minor dischargers under the NPDES Program to participate in the annual DMR-QA Study Program. The DMR-QA Study evaluates the analytical ability of laboratories that routinely perform or support self-monitoring analyses required by NPDES permits. There are two options to satisfy the requirements of the DMR-QA Study Program: (1) The Discharger can obtain and analyze a DMR-QA sample as part of the DMR-QA Study; or (2) Per the waiver issued by USEPA to the State Water Board, the Discharger can submit the results of the most recent Water Pollution Performance Evaluation Study from its own laboratories or its contract laboratories. A Water Pollution Performance Evaluation Study is similar to the DMR-QA Study. Thus, it also evaluates a laboratory's ability to analyze wastewater samples to produce quality data that ensure the integrity of the NPDES Program. The Discharger shall ensure that the results of the DMR-QA Study or the results of the most recent Water Pollution Performance Evaluation Study are submitted annually to the State Water Board. The State Water Board's Quality

Assurance Program Officer will send the DMR-QA Study results or the results of the most recent Water Pollution Performance Evaluation Study to USEPA's DMR-QA Coordinator and Quality Assurance Manager.

IX. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.

The Regional Water Board has considered the issuance of WDRs that will serve as an NPDES permit for Oxnard Wastewater Treatment Plant. As a step in the WDR adoption process, the Regional Water Board staff has developed tentative WDRs and has encouraged public participation in the WDR adoption process.

A. Notification of Interested Parties

The Regional Water Board notified the Discharger and interested agencies and persons of its intent to prescribe WDRs for the discharge and provided an opportunity to submit written comments and recommendations. Notification was also provided through posting of the public notice on the entry gate of the OWTP and the following:

The public had access to the Regional Board's website at http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/losangeles/.

B. Written Comments

Interested persons were invited to submit written comments concerning tentative WDRs as provided through the notification process. Comments were due either in person or by mail to the Executive Office at the Regional Water Board at the address on the cover page of this Order, or by email submitted to elizabeth.erickson@waterboards.ca.gov.

To be fully responded to by staff and considered by the Regional Water Board, the written comments were due at the Regional Water Board office by 5:00 p.m. on **September 17, 2018**.

C. Public Hearing

The Regional Water Board held a public hearing on the tentative WDRs during its regular Board meeting on the following date and time and at the following location:

Date: October 11, 2018

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Location: Metropolitan Water District's Board Room,
700 North Alameda Street,
Los Angeles, 90012.

Interested persons were invited to attend. At the public hearing, the Regional Water Board heard testimony, pertinent to the discharge, WDRs, and permit. For accuracy of the record, important testimony was requested in writing.

The Regional Water Board's web address is www.waterboards.ca.gov/losangeles where interested persons can access the current agenda for changes in Board meeting dates, times, and venues.

D. Reconsideration of Waste Discharge Requirements

Any aggrieved person may petition the State Water Board to review the decision of the Regional Water Board regarding the final WDRs. The petition must be received by the State

Water Board at the following address within 30 calendar days of the Regional Water Board's action:

State Water Resources Control Board

Office of Chief Counsel

P.O. Box 100, 1001 I Street

Sacramento, CA 95812-0100

For instructions on how to file a petition for review, see:

<http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/public_notices/petitions/water_quality/wqpetition_instr.shtml>

E. Information and Copying

The ROWD, related documents, tentative effluent limitations and special conditions, comments received, and other information are on file and may be inspected at 320 West 4th Street, Suite 200, Los Angeles, California and 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, California any time between 8:30 a.m. and 4:45 p.m., Monday through Friday. Copying of documents may be arranged through the Regional Water Board by calling (213) 576-6600.

F. Register of Interested Persons

Any person interested in being placed on the mailing list for information regarding the WDRs and NPDES permit should contact the Regional Water Board, reference this facility, and provide a name, address, and phone number.

G. Additional Information

Requests for additional information or questions regarding this Order should be directed to Elizabeth Erickson at (213) 576-6665 or elizabeth.erickson@waterboards.ca.gov.

ATTACHMENT G – TOXICITY REDUCTION EVALUATION (TRE) WORK PLAN OUTLINE

1. **Gather and Review Information and Data**
   - A. POTW Operations and Performance
   - B. POTW Influent and Pretreatment Program
   - C. Effluent Data, including Toxicity Results
   - D. Sludge (Biosolids) Data
2. **Evaluate Facility Performance**
3. **Conduct Toxicity Identification Evaluation (TIE)**
4. **Evaluate Sources and In-Plant Controls**
5. **Implement Toxicity Control Measures**
6. **Conduct Confirmatory Toxicity Testing**

H.

ATTACHMENT H– BIOSOLIDS AND SLUDGE MANAGEMENT BIOSOLIDS USE AND DISPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

(Note: "Biosolids" refers to non-hazardous sewage sludge as defined in 40 CFR §503.9. Sewage sludge that is hazardous, as defined in 40 CFR part 261, must be disposed of in accordance with the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA).) 40 CFR §503 requirements identified below are for information only and are not regulated by this Order.

I. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

A. All biosolids generated by the Discharger shall be reused or disposed of in compliance with the applicable portions of:

1. 40 CFR part 503: for biosolids that are land applied, placed in surface disposal sites (dedicated land disposal sites or monofills), or incinerated; 40 CFR § 503 Subpart B (land application) applies to biosolids placed on the land for the purposes of providing nutrients or conditioning the soil for crops or vegetation. 40 CFR § 503 Subpart C (surface disposal) applies to biosolids placed on land for the purpose of disposal.
2. 40 CFR part 258: for biosolids disposed of in a municipal solid waste landfill.
3. 40 CFR part 257: for all biosolids use and disposal practices not covered under 40 CFR parts 258 or 503.

B. The Discharger is responsible for assuring that all biosolids from its facility are used or disposed of in accordance with 40 CFR part 503, whether the Discharger uses or disposes of the biosolids itself, or transfers their biosolids to another party for further treatment, reuse, or disposal. The Discharger is responsible for informing subsequent preparers, appliers, and disposers of requirements they must meet under 40 CFR part 503.

C. Duty to mitigate: The Discharger shall take all reasonable steps to prevent or minimize any biosolids use or disposal which may adversely impact human health or the environment.

D. No biosolids shall be allowed to enter wetland or other waters of the United States.

E. Biosolids treatment, storage, use or disposal shall not contaminate groundwater.

F. Biosolids treatment, storage, use or disposal shall not create a nuisance such as objectionable odors or flies.

G. The Discharger shall assure that haulers transporting biosolids off site for further treatment, storage, reuse, or disposal take all necessary measures to keep the biosolids contained.

H. If biosolids are stored for over two years from the time they are generated, the Discharger must ensure compliance with all the requirements for surface disposal under 40 CFR part 503 Subpart C, or must submit a written request to USEPA with the information in part 503.20 (b), requesting permission for longer temporary storage.

I. Sewage sludge containing more than 50 mg/kg PCBs shall be disposed of in accordance with 40 CFR part 761.

J. There shall be adequate screening at the plant headworks and/or at the biosolids treatment units to ensure that all pieces of metal, plastic, glass, and other inert